

UNTO WHAT END?

What lecturer has not experienced the difficulty of recalling, as he leaves the platform, some link in his argument, some link in his discourse which he has lost some while he such of his theme? I have often made and extremely slight mistakes in my speeches, and lapses such as this, and others, have been a source of vexation. The failing to find a suitable word, or to write due statement of facts, or to remember what to be either true, false or doubtful, may be due to me the house, or to the audience, or to the speaker, or an earnestness of thought which has led him off my line of argument.

My friends, UNTO WHAT END?

as to why Europe is not at peace
at home and abroad, and
that too merely

ideal is a strong **Bernard Noël Langdon-Davies.**

seen in her people's minds in Europe. More than half of the nations, even in America, public opinion is favorable to a reasonable partition of Europe, and as we are passing out of the era of enlightened views in international affairs, and of a stimulus on the part of a wise statesman to turn the scale, yet still in the old ways of old kinds of pacification, the world is divided. It seems ever to drift about, as though the winds were bearing European nations this way and that, and willy-nilly American nations to Europe.

But there is another reason for my coming here, that is to show why Europe must be a peaceful. Whatever your fiscal policy may be or however many new industries you may develop, whatever policy

UNTO WHAT END?

What lecturer has not experienced the shock of recalling, as he leaves the platform, some vital point of his argument, some link in his chain of reasoning, some whole branch of his theme which he has entirely and irremediably omitted? It is to provide against lapses such as this, and also to render a little more permanent the flying words of a brief hour, that I write this statement of my case. If it cannot claim to be either literature or oratory, those who have done me the honor to listen to my lectures will accept it as an earnest of good faith, since herein I put on record my line of argument and challenge reply.

My first point is in answer to the obvious question as to why I have come to America instead of staying at home and talking to Europeans. The answer is that the moral force of America, where the Peace ideal is so strong and where European affairs can be seen in perspective, is invaluable for our campaign in Europe. Moreover, the United States, perhaps alone of nations, can to-day, if it chooses, declare that its public opinion is overwhelmingly on the side of sane, reasoned pacifism, of such an educational campaign as we are pursuing for the purpose of promoting an enlightened view of international relations. Such an attitude on the part of a great nation would probably turn the scale; yet, despite the strength of certain kinds of pacifism here, the policy of the United States seems ever to drift along the same stream as is steadily bearing European nations into the morass. That is why America matters to Europe.

But there is another reason for my coming, and that is to show why Europe matters to America. Whatever your fiscal policy may be or become, whatever new industries you may develop, whatever policy

you may adopt in regard to armaments, one thing is certain: you are deeply and vitally concerned with the question of whether Europe spends her money productively or unproductively.

America needs among the teeming millions of Europe markets of all kinds; with your expanding population and your tremendous resources to develop, that need must constantly increase. A few decades ago you were buying engineering machinery from Europe; to-day she is buying it from you. A few months ago, one might say, you were buying automobiles from Europe; to-day she is buying them from you. There are two things at least which will cause Europe to buy from you, so long as she has the wherewithal: your limitless resources and that genius of yours for speed. But Europe cannot buy if she has no money.

For the development of your resources, for the provision of a field for your genius, you require of Europe another thing. You require cheap and abundant capital. Your vast territories, a great part of which to-day is undeveloped, call for that means of development in our days—capital. But Europe cannot lend if she is bankrupt.

For both the reasons here given and because your people are driving forward new industries on a narrow margin of profit; because your laborers, seeing all around them new wealth continually created, are ever more insistent for a larger share in the products of their toil; for these and other reasons you need in Europe industrial security, freedom from interruptions of trade and the consequent loss of wealth. But Europe cannot have industrial peace while her laborers are starving.

Lastly, you need from Europe immigrants of a better type than to-day crowd the steerage of every ship that comes to your shores. You need, not the weakest who have been crushed out by the strain and stress of life at home, not those who are allowed to

emigrate because their physique is too poor for military service, not the moral and physical weaklings, but those strong men and women who seek a wider field of endeavor than they can find in the crowded countries of the Old World. It may be, indeed, that you cause Europe to-day to neglect the social problems she ought to solve, because she can throw so much of the refuse her systems produce on to your shores.

What is it, then, which is happening in Europe? The answer is clear. Europe is going bankrupt, and the reason, as is usually the case, is her waste expenditure. England alone spends every year \$400,000,000 on armaments; Germany as much; France, Russia, Austria, Italy; the great Powers of Europe are heading straight for bankruptcy. Markets! How can America find new markets where millions are starving in order that new dreadnoughts may be built and new army corps enrolled? Capital! Why, in May of this year, Germany, with all her mighty power, military and industrial, sought to raise for civil purposes of her own a paltry loan of \$55,000,000 and failed. How can America look to Europe for that capital she needs? Industrial security! In every nation of Europe to-day is growing, I will not say without cause, the murmur of discontent. Men will not bear for long that, when all declare their aim is peace, peace should be one long nightmare of danger and of fear of destitution because it is armed. Of the narrow margin that the laborer can save against his hour of need the greater part is taken from him that his country may be armed—for what? They say, to secure the peace which is so great a blessing to him now. But every year it costs him more to secure that blessing by such means, and every year he is told by his newspapers and his politicians that war is more probable than ever, that he must pay more, serve longer, work harder. In such a Europe can America expect industrial security?

Perhaps stated thus and viewed from across the ocean, such things may seem to you in America mere signs of madness. Perhaps they are signs of madness; but none the less they are true. England and Germany each vows, and to all seeming honestly vows, that she has no intention of attacking the other. Yet each is firmly persuaded that she is in deadly danger of attack by the other. It would be comic, were it not for the tragedy. Think of a laborer on \$5 a week, with a wife and half a dozen children to support; more than \$1 goes for the single wretched room which shelters them; \$3 for the food which just keeps all alive—or does not; \$1 left for clothes, for sickness, for unemployment, for—save the mark!—pleasure, the joy of life. Yet, hounded on by his press, inspired by his orators, trembling with the fears they rouse in him, lured by their specious promises, he votes for more dreadnoughts, for more army corps. Laugh at his folly, if you can; I cannot, for I have seen him.

Well, what have I to say? What solution have I to propose? Perhaps I shall best explain by stating, as simply as I may, the thesis of "The Great Illusion," that thesis which I have come to spread abroad in this country.

The civilized nations of the world are to-day ruining themselves with their enormous armies and navies. In Europe as in America the burden of taxation is ever on the increase, and the mass of that taxation is for war and the munitions of war, neither of which can benefit the lives of the peoples. All sane men who think of these things are agreed so far. Hitherto there have been two sets of proposals for solving the difficulty. On the one hand we have the militarists who say: "Arm! Arm! The only way for England to have peace is to be stronger than Germany. The only way for Germany to have peace is to be stronger than England. Man is an unreasoning fighting animal; therefore give him plenty of dynamite," and so

on. Every one of them knows precisely what the other countries are preparing to do to his, every one of them declares that his own countrymen are lethargic, indolent, decadent, and selfish. On the other hand we have the older schools of pacifism. Their creed is at least saner and more logical than that of the militarists; but they preach chiefly of love and brotherhood, an appeal not likely to succeed except with those who love and feel as brothers. Meanwhile the merchant, the laborer, the professional man, the great mass of healthy, hard-working humanity is unimpressed by either. They know well enough that war is bad for them, that they are being crippled with taxation, that "peace in our time" is from the bottom of their hearts their prayer. But they have vague notions of the welfare and glory of the nation as apart from the individuals composing it; they look back to the days of old, as depicted in their history books, and fancy that everyone fought and everyone worth considering won and nobody suffered. And, if they go a little further than this, they still find themselves in an impasse. Yes, we can see it, but those fool Germans or those fool Japanese or those fool English, as the case may be, will not see it, and we must look out.

Now it is just for these men who do the work and bear the burdens and form the public opinion and mould the policies of nations that "The Great Illusion" was written. In it, clear as crystal, appears that principle which all the more advanced pacifists and thinkers can dimly see. And the principle is just this:

All the nations of the world are arming, and all assert that they are arming in self-defence. Defence is unnecessary unless someone is going to attack. No one will attack unless he has a motive for attack. The only possible motive for attack is the desire to reap the fruits of conquest. If it can be demonstrated that, as between civilized nations to-day, there can be no fruits of conquest, that in the twentieth century that

is a harvest which cannot be reaped; if that fact can be shown clearly to the general public of all nations, then, presto! the motive for attack, the need for defence, the burden of armaments, the danger of war will vanish and the stage will be clear for coöperation, for arbitration in disputes, for united action to police undeveloped or rebellious peoples and, more than all, for mankind's true war, the war with Nature, with the planet on which he lives, with the social problems engendered by vice, ignorance, disease, and all the mysterious forces which spread enough misery already among the great family of mankind.

This simple fact, that there are no fruits of conquest, Mr. Norman Angell has proved beyond dispute in his book. This is the New Pacifism with which intellectual Europe is ringing, which appeals to crowned heads and mill-hands, to university scholars and shopkeepers alike.

And now for an outline of the proof.

The New Pacifists say that international policy today is almost invariably based upon illusions, illusions which are evidenced by such false notions as that colonies are owned and can therefore be captured, that by annexing populated territory the annexing nation gains, that armaments guarantee or make trade, that war preserves a virile race, that war can be made to pay by the exaction of tribute or indemnity. Every one of these ideas they challenge and are prepared to bring evidence to prove that they are false alike in theory and in practice. That they may have been at some time true, the New Pacifists are prepared to admit; but, they say, certain things have happened in the world which make them no longer true. The first two of these things are the division of labor, by which is meant that different towns and countries specialize in different industries and even in different parts of the same industry, and quickness of communication and transport, which intensifies this specializing proc-

ess. Two communities cut off from each other and the rest of the world went on existing in a hand-to-mouth, unenterprising way as best they could, and the extinction of one made not a whit of difference to the other. But in a world where—let us say—Germany sells toys to England, which England pays for by selling machinery to build a dock at the mouth of the Amazon, because the Brazilian coffee planters want to sell coffee to Russia, which the Russians pay for by sending petrol to France, because the Frenchmen send silk to America, which Americans pay for by sending raw cotton to Japan, which sends art-wares to Europe, things are a little different. You cannot break a link in that chain, and the industrial life of a nation is only maintained by its holding tight to its bit of as many thousands of sound chains as it can, without making the whole thing useless; and if, let us say, Germany were to go to war with anyone, the Americans would not be able to buy that silk or to sell that raw cotton.

These are the chief reasons, but there are others. The credit system, on which the vast volume of trade is necessarily and advantageously built to-day, makes war, which deprives of most of its value all the commercial paper of the belligerent nations, disastrous to the whole civilized world; while finance at once visualizes the effect of war policy upon the industrial life of nations. The decline of force, the appreciation that if one man is master and the other slave there are two prisoners, one at each end of the rope, and that it is better to coöperate so that each can go about his business contented, is another factor. The net results of it all are that the political and the economic or commercial frontiers of a nation are to-day not identical (Lancashire, for example, is in some senses a province of the United States and Louisiana a province of England) and that the wealth of a modern nation is intangible. Such wealth cannot be affected by conquest, since, slavery being a thing of the past, you cannot touch

the capital, and, the income being chiefly produced by the inhabitants having money to spend, you cannot seize that without automatically destroying what you try to seize and having all the cost of war and policing besides.

There are, of course, many other points which occur. "Nations do not go to war for material gain," we are told, "but for their honor." Our reply is that honor is of all things the one which force cannot vindicate; every argument which applied to the duel applies to war. We are informed that the morale of a nation will suffer by constant peace. Our answer is contained in a question: Which are the most virile races, those who believe in the rule of force most or those who believe in it least? The Turks or the Canadians? The Indians or the Americans? The Arabians or the English?

I have, of course, not space here to develop the thesis to the full; I must refer my audiences to the pages of "The Great Illusion" and to the other works of Mr. Norman Angell, for I must hasten on to a brief description of the institution founded to promote the study of international polity on the lines suggested by "The Great Illusion."

The Garton Foundation is named after the great London banker, Sir Richard Garton, who endowed it. By his side at the head stand The Right Honorable A. J. Balfour, former Prime Minister of England; Viscount Esher, permanent member of the Committee of Imperial Defence, and Norman Angell. In the English universities the policy promoted by the foundation is the establishment of what are called War and Peace Societies. The object of these societies is not ostensibly pacifist; the scheme is that all who desire to study the problems of international polity are welcome as members, for we are confident that a careful study of these problems can lead to but one conclusion. Such societies have already been formed at

the universities of Cambridge, Glasgow, Manchester, and elsewhere, and similar societies have been formed in five or six German universities. To reach other leaders of opinion the Foundation has been sending lecturers all over England, in some cases with a single lecture, in others to deliver a course of five or six. The objective of all these lectures is the formation of Study Circles. These are similar to the War and Peace Societies, but are more of the nature of regular classes and are commonly provided from outside with a leader. There are to-day dozens of these circles in active existence and they are being formed in all parts of Great Britain. Early this year it became apparent that a single institution could not provide lecturers, literature, and study circle leaders for all parts of England, to say nothing of other countries. The Foundation has therefore adopted a more extensive policy. It has begun to promote the establishment in large cities and populous districts of organizations similar and affiliated to itself. These are self-supporting and in their turn spread the study in their own districts by means of lectures, study circles, etc. In some cases they pursue a more propagandist and less purely educational policy. Under The Manchester Norman Angell League, a wealthy and powerful organization, open-air lectures and speeches to laborers are daily delivered; the Association for the Right Understanding of International Interests is, besides its other activities in London, holding popular demonstrations in the parks; while in Glasgow and Newcastle the clubs are keeping more closely to the lines of the parent Foundation. These clubs, which we call by the general name of International Polity Clubs, have already been formed in many places, such as Manchester, London, Leeds, Newcastle and elsewhere, and are about to be formed in many more, among which may be mentioned Edinburgh, Sheffield, Bristol, and Liverpool.

Such have been the main activities of the Foundation during the first year and a quarter of its existence; but there are many more points that might be mentioned. We have issued pamphlets, trained lecturers, assisted students' tours, conducted newspaper controversies, and coöperated with the activities of the older peace societies. To-day the demand for our activities is far greater than, with our limited resources, we are able to meet. Our regular lecturers have every day up to Christmas and already most days for the spring full. I myself have had to leave my work of organization in England and Germany and to come to the United States. Mr. Angell is to come here when I leave. We have fields opening up not only in Germany, but in France, Austria, and Italy. In October appears the first number of *War and Peace*, a Norman Angell monthly, which is to be published with our coöperation. Next year we shall probably hold a congress in London, to which representatives from all our branches will be invited. We have books in preparation, pamphlets in the press, centres waiting for organization, more work on our hands than we can accomplish.

From this brief sketch it may be seen that never has a movement, especially an intellectual movement, advanced with such giant strides as this. Four years ago there was only the Old Pacifism, a movement of great, courageous men fighting a world of prejudice with such weapons as they could command. A year and a half ago there was in Europe no pacifist organization that was not written down by the general public as an association of cranks and faddists and that did not, between ourselves, in some measure deserve the reputation. To-day the whole face of the pacifist movement is changed; we hold public debates, invite public questions, address meetings of army officers, seek out the honest but mistaken enemy and thresh out with him the questions. Thousands are giving us

their moral support every month and, as the creed of the man who not only can but will think, ours holds the field.

One word now on the subject of the most popular alternative to our method, and I have done. There are many in England and in America who will not listen to us, because, they say, they have a weapon in the General Strike which will prove more effective in the cause of Peace than ours. I am enjoying many opportunities of discussion with those who hold that view. As briefly as possible I will here sum up the line of my argument on that point.

Doubtless the General Strike would be effective to stop, possibly to avert, war. It is not my concern to be opposed to it or in favor of it. Certain difficulties, however, I would point out. Until you have a great majority of the laborers of all civilized nations organized your remedy is almost useless; it would probably serve but to protract a war and to make it in each case a double war, internal as well as external. Supposing, moreover, that you have got your great majority, you have still the problem of armed peace to solve and public opinion has not yet evolved the solution of that. Moreover, on the way, while you are forming your organization, you are bound to evoke from fellow-laborers and others bitter hostility and opposition; for, rightly or wrongly, they feel that there is in your position an element of treachery to the idea of nationality which they respect and love. Finally, I fail to see what there is in your scheme which is inconsistent with a vigorous prosecution of ours. The General Strike to prevent war would at least cause vast loss and suffering and want; surely if the peoples can evolve a public opinion which will accomplish its ends without the necessity of its terrible operation, its supporters would be the better pleased. Because the law provides a penalty for actual or attempted crime, that is no reason why we should not educate men not